



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/065,787	04/23/1998	RODNEY GLEN ADAMS	17275-P043US	7960

21909 7590 07/31/2002

CARR LAW FIRM, L.L.P.
670 FOUNDERS SQUARE
900 JACKSON STREET
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

LOGSDON, JOSEPH B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/065,787

Applicant(s)

ADAMS ET AL.

Examiner

Joe Logsdon

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2001 and 9 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph:

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 13 is an apparatus claim that ends with a step.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. 103(a):

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2662

5. Claims 1, 6, 11-13, 15-18, 20-22, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Hyde-Thomson. Brown discloses an apparatus and method for providing translation services to telecommunications processes for sending an information message over the Internet to an unknown address of a recipient when a unique identifier for the recipient is known (abstract; column 2, lines 56-61). The method comprises the steps of receiving an e-mail message which includes the information message and a unique identifier of the recipient; extracting the identifier from the message and querying a directory server for the address (such as the e-mail address) of the recipient; receiving the address as a response to the query; inserting the address into the information message; and forwarding the resulting message over the Internet (column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 11). A service provider performs these steps, and according to an embodiment the messages are received from the Internet (column 3, lines 17-31). According to an embodiment, a voice messaging system and an e-mail host are used. A telephone subscriber uses the voice messaging system (VMS) to create a voice message. The recipient of the voice message is identified using a telephone number. The VMS converts the voice message to an e-mail format such as SMTP, which is a data network format. The VMS then addresses the message and forwards it over the Internet to the SMTP host of the service provider. Upon receiving the message, the SMTP host passes it to an application process that stores it in memory and receives the address from the directory server as described above. Upon receiving the e-mail address, the SMTP host sends the translated voice message to the recipient's e-mail mailbox (column 4, lines 30-46; column 4, line 53 to column 5, line 7). The invention inherently involves push technology because no action on the part of the recipient is required for delivery of the message to the recipient's mailbox. Brown

Art Unit: 2662

fails to teach that the e-mail address of the recipient is known by the sender and is the unique identifier. Hyde-Thomson teaches a message handling system in which a voice message is converted to a digital voice file, which is stored in a shared memory device corresponding to the intended recipient's mailbox (abstract). A user can use standard e-mail message software (column 3, lines 54-57). It has been well known in the art that one specifies the e-mail address of the recipient of an e-mail message, when one uses standard e-mail message software. A voice gateway PC records and digitizes the user's voice message, and attaches the digitized voice file to a text e-mail file. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Brown so that the e-mail address is known by the sender and is the unique identifier b, as in Hyde-Thomson, because e-mail addresses are oftentimes easy for users to remember and specifying the e-mail address by the user would reduce network traffic.

6. Claims 2, 7, 14, 19, 32, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Hyde-Thomson, as applied to claims 1, 6, 13, 17, and 30 above, and further in view of Burg. Brown and Hyde-Thomson fail to teach that the called party is notified of the incoming call. Burg discloses an apparatus and method which allow a called party to connect to a data network using a telephone transmission line (abstract). If the called party's computer is logged into the network, a telephony gateway notifies the called party of the incoming call; the format and content of the received message, as well as options for handling the call, are provided to the called party (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 16; column 8, lines 38-42). The transmission of the notification is inherently nearly simultaneous with the transmission of the translated voice message if the recipient is logged onto the network. This type of notification is

Art Unit: 2662

by definition a page, and it is a short message. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inventions of Brown and Hyde-Thomson so that the called party is informed when an incoming call arrives, and the called party is informed of the format and options for handling the call, as in Burg, because such an arrangement allows the caller and called party to communicate as soon as either party desires to communicate, which is the primary motivation for converting voice into e-mail.

7. Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, Hyde-Thomson, and Burg, as applied to claims 2, 7, and 32 above, and further in view of Emery et al.

With regard to claims 3, 8, and 41, neither Brown nor Hyde-Thomson nor Burg teaches the option of using a wireless network. Emery et al. discloses a system and method in which an advanced intelligent network (AIN) wireline system connects to and controls processing of calls to a personal communication service subscriber's wireless communication network (abstract). Examiner takes Official Notice that the sending of notifications as pages or short message service messages has been well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inventions of Brown, Hyde-Thomson, and Burg so that they use wireless communication networks, as in Emery et al., because such an arrangement would provide a communication service that is adaptable to each user's individual lifestyle.

With regard to claims 4, 5, 9, and 10, neither Brown nor Hyde-Thomson teaches the sending of notifications in the form of pages or short message service messages. Burg discloses an apparatus and method that allow a called party to connect to a data network using a telephone

Art Unit: 2662

transmission line (abstract). If the called party's computer is logged into the network, a telephony gateway notifies the called party of the incoming call; the format and content of the received message, as well as options for handling the call, are provided to the called party (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 16; column 8, lines 38-42). This type of notification is by definition a page, and it is a short message. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inventions of Brown and Hyde-Thomson so that the called party is informed when an incoming call arrives, and the called party is informed of the format and options for handling the call, as in Burg, because such an arrangement allows the caller and called party to communicate as soon as either party desires to communicate, which is the primary motivation for converting voice into e-mail.

8. Claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Hyde-Thomson, Burg, and Emery et al. Brown discloses an apparatus and method for providing translation services to telecommunications processes for sending an information message over the Internet to an unknown address of a recipient when a unique identifier for the recipient is known (abstract; column 2, lines 56-61). The method comprises the steps of receiving an e-mail message which includes the information message and a unique identifier of the recipient; extracting the identifier from the message and querying a directory server for the address (such as the e-mail address) of the recipient; receiving the address as a response to the query; inserting the address into the information message; and forwarding the resulting message over the Internet (column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 11). A service provider performs these steps, and according to an embodiment the messages are received from the Internet (column 3,

Art Unit: 2662

lines 17-31). According to an embodiment, a voice messaging system and an e-mail host are used. A telephone subscriber uses the voice messaging system (VMS) to create a voice message. The recipient of the voice message is identified using a telephone number. The VMS converts the voice message to an e-mail format such as SMTP. The VMS then addresses the message and forwards it over the Internet to the SMTP host of the service provider. Upon receiving the message, the SMTP host passes it to an application process that stores it in memory and receives the address from the directory server as described above. Upon receiving the e-mail address, the SMTP host sends the translated voice message to the recipient's e-mail mailbox (column 4, lines 30-46; column 4, line 53 to column 5, line 7).

Brown fails to teach that the e-mail address of the recipient is known by the sender and is the unique identifier; Brown fails to teach that the called party is notified of the incoming call; and Brown fails to teach the option of using a wireless network.

Hyde-Thomson teaches a message handling system in which a voice message is converted to a digital voice file, which is stored in a shared memory device corresponding to the intended recipient's mailbox (abstract). A user can use standard e-mail message software (column 3, lines 54-57). It has been well known in the art that one specifies the e-mail address of the recipient of an e-mail message, when one uses standard e-mail message software. A voice gateway PC records and digitizes the user's voice message, and attaches the digitized voice file to a text e-mail file. Burg discloses an apparatus and method that allow a called party to connect to a data network using a telephone transmission line (abstract). If the called party's computer is logged into the network, a telephony gateway notifies the called party of the incoming call; the format and content of the received message, as well as options for handling the call, are provided

Art Unit: 2662

to the called party (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 16; column 8, lines 38-42). The transmission of the notification is inherently nearly simultaneous with the transmission of the translated voice message if the recipient is logged onto the network. This type of notification is by definition a page, and it is a short message. Emery et al. discloses a system and method in which an advanced intelligent network (AIN) wireline system connects to and controls processing of calls to a personal communication service subscriber's wireless communication network (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Brown so that the e-mail address is known by the sender and is the unique identifier, as in Hyde-Thomson, because e-mail addresses are oftentimes easy for users to remember and specifying the e-mail address by the user would reduce network traffic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Brown so that the called party is informed when an incoming call arrives, and the called party is informed of the format and options for handling the call, as in Burg, because such an arrangement allows the caller and called party to communicate as soon as either party desires to communicate, which is the primary motivation for converting voice into e-mail. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Brown so that it uses a wireless communication network, as in Emery et al., because such an arrangement would provide a communication service that is adaptable to each user's individual lifestyle.

9. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Hyde-Thomson, as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Finnigan. Brown and Hyde-

Art Unit: 2662

Thomson fail to teach a certification means. Finnigan discloses a voice message store and forward service in which notification of success or failure of the message transfer is provided (column 2, lines 38-42; column 9, lines 40-53; claim 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inventions of Brown and Hyde-Thomson so that certification is provided, as in Finnigan, because certification provides proof of receipt of the message.

10. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Hyde-Thomson, as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of the Admitted Prior Art. Brown and Hyde-Thomson fail to teach the use of means for recognizing touch tone codes as representing network addresses. The Admitted Prior Art teaches that an established prior art protocol may be used to enter an address using the touch tone keys (page 8, lines 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inventions of Brown and Hyde-Thomson so that the identifier is entered using touch tones because such an arrangement would allow callers to easily and quickly provide the address of the recipient using a readily available touch tone telephone.

Response to Arguments:

11. Applicant argues that if the user in Brown were to input and e-mail address, the intended functionality of Brown would be destroyed. But the mere fact that a modification is made (i.e.,

Art Unit: 2662

the user specifies the e-mail address of the recipient) does not imply that the functionality is destroyed.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Logsdon whose telephone number is (703) 305-2419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 1:00 pm to 9:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (703) 305-4744.

Art Unit: 2662

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

14. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT".

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Joe Logsdon

Patent Examiner

Monday, July 01, 2002



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600